

02-277

Jane L. Cox
63 Nassau Blvd.
Garden City NY 11530

Commissioner Michael J. Coops
Federal Communication Commission
445 12th street
SW Washington DC 20554

Dear Mr. Coops,

Enclosed please find the NY Times article that made me aware of the current F.C.C. agenda. The article was later brought to the attention of a local women's issue group causing them to individually express their concerns to the F.C.C. Then, having obtained data from the internet, I felt an obligation to further inform others. Thus, the article and enclosed letter was mailed to Long Island Colleges, a few legislators and national organizations, and some friends and relatives.

Because you are in opposition to Michael K. Powell's deregulation agenda I decided To send this correspondence to to you. This information should have been before the public in full force. Our too IV national media networks could have helmed the public become fully aware. They evidently sought not to do this. Most readers of the NY Times probably would not have noticed it on page 19A. Thus, much of the public, probably most of the public were, and probably remain unaware of this momentous consideration by the F.C.C.

Of course, since the major networks have been pushing for deregulations, it would not have been in their financial interest to inform the public. It did not make front page news. This may then be considered evidence of a case whereby financial interests ruled out the sharing of very important news information for wide-spread dissemination. It helps somewhat to convince one that present rulings should remain and more rulings might need to be put in place concerning mass media networks and cross media ownership.

FEB 06 2003

Distribution Center

Jane E. Cox
53 Nassau ulvd.
Garden City NY 11530

Page 2 - To: Michael J. Copps

A I of ruling under review by the F.C.C. should be maintained. TV and radio, the medias of easy and free access, need the rulings to assure competition. particularity in todays's world. We surely have learned through business activities in the past decade that lack of **rules** protecting the overall public interest leads to corporate greed, Fraud, dishonesty, questionable mergers, and enhances collusion. these rulings established in 1975 set the stage for the **public** to receive their news information from more balanced sources.

Thank you for your attention and support.

Sincerely yours,

Jane E. Cox

Jane E. Cox
53 Nassau Blvd.
Garden City NY 11530
Jan. 20, 2003

All News Media Inc.

Page 41, Jan 20, 2003
By Bill Kovach
and Tom Rosenstiel

WASHINGTON
Without much notice, the federal government is moving toward the most sweeping change ever in the rules that govern ownership of the American news media.

This shift could reduce the independence of the news media and the ability of Americans to take part in public debate. Yet because of meager press coverage and steps taken by the Federal Communications Commission in its policy-making process, most people probably have no idea that it is taking place.

Having seen how totalitarian regimes moved the world to war through domination of their news media, the government during the 1930's put restrictions on how many news media outlets one company could own, both nationally and in a single city.

Though those rules have been relaxed in the last 20 years, companies are still blocked from buying a newspaper and television station in the same city or from owning more than one TV station in the same market.

Three weeks after it proposed eliminating those rules, the F.C.C. released a series of reports about the current media marketplace. But the reports focused almost entirely on the economic impact of relaxing the ownership rules. They largely ignore the public's interest in a diverse and independent press.

The F.C.C. argues that technologies like the Internet offer Americans access to more information than ever

Bill Kovach is chairman of the Committee of Concerned Journalists. Tom Rosenstiel is director of the Project for Excellence in Journalism.

New York Times

and thus worries about monopolies are unfounded. But studies also show that most Americans receive their news from a handful of outlets. Beyond this, much of what appears on the Internet is repackaged from those outlets. The number of operations that gather original news is small and now may become smaller.

The question of concentration is most acute at the local level. In most communities, even those with television and radio stations, the vast range of activities are covered by only one institution, the local newspaper.

What will happen to communities in

The F.C.C.
considers letting
fewer own more.

the ownership rules are eliminated? Among the possibilities is that one or two companies in each town would have an effective monopoly on reaching consumers by being allowed to control the newspaper, radio, TV, billboard and more — with costly consequences for businesses that need those outlets for advertising. Such a monopoly on information would also reduce the diversity of cultural and political discourse in a community.

The precedent in radio is telling. Since the rules on ownership of radio were last relaxed in 1996, the two biggest companies went from owning 130 stations to more than 1,400.

The F.C.C. chairman, Michael K. Powell, has scheduled only one public hearing, in Richmond, Va., on the proposal, and the public comment period will close at the end of this month. It is a small and brief opportunity, but one that the public should seize if it cherishes an independent press.

0222

This article from the N.Y. Times expresses serious concerns about possible deregulations of news media by the FCC. If you agree with the authors analysis, it is important to share your views by the end of January with:

Chairman Michael K. Powell
Federal Communication Commission
445 12th St.
5N Washington DC 20554

Below is a list of available internet information:

1. <http://www.fcc.gov/ownership> 2 pages
2. http://ftp.fcc.gov/bureaus/mass-media/News_Releases/2001/nrm0109.html 3 pages
3. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wa-dyn/A3541-2003Jan2?language=Printer+6+pages>
4. <http://www.eninet.org/books/cross-ownership.html>
5. http://www.democraticmedia.org/issues/media_ownership/index.html

Thank you for your interest. As noted time is of the essence.

Sincerely,



1. *Phragmites australis* (Cav.) Trin. ex Steud.

Figure 1. Schematic representation of the experimental design. The subjects were divided into two groups: the control group (CG) and the intervention group (IG). The CG received no intervention, while the IG received a 6-week intervention program. The outcome measures were measured at baseline (T0), post-intervention (T1), and follow-up (T2).